REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 16-20, 23-25, 38, 41 and 54 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 16, 38 and 41 are amended herein, claims 2 and 17 are canceled, and claims 55-56 are new. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 16, 18-20, 23-25, 38, 41, and 54-56 are pending upon entry of this amendment. Support for the claim amendments and new claims is found throughout the specification, including, for example, at paragraphs 20, 50, 51, 56 and 61, and also in FIGs. 3 and 4.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 38, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schumacher et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,631,345) in view of Weber et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,305,205). Claim 2 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Schumacher in view of Weber and further in view of Gray et al. (U.S. Pat. App. 2005/0060719). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schumacher in view of Weber and further in view of Yee et al (U.S. Pat. 6,380,924). Claims 11 and 12 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schumacher in view of Weber and further in view of Tervo et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,907,577). Claims 16-18 and 41 are rejected as being unpatentable over Gray in view of Schumacher. Claim 19-20 and 23-25 are rejected as being unpatentable over Gray in view of Schumacher and further in view of Jade et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0001854). Applicant traverses these rejections as applied to the amended claims and discusses the rejections together for clarity.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

> receiving, with the capture processor, a plurality of keystrokes associated with a prior application with focus monitored by the capture processor;
>
> determining, with the capture processor, that the focus has changed from the prior application monitored by the capture processor to a new application monitored by the capture processor;
>
> *resetting, with the capture processor, the keystrokes captured from the prior application by clearing the captured keystrokes responsive to determining that the focus has changed;*
>
> …

Thus, claim 1 has been amended with additional features relating to the capture processor. The capture processor now receives keystrokes associated with a prior application. The capture processor determines that focus has changed from a prior application to a new application. The capture processor also resets keystrokes captured from the prior application responsive to determining that the focus has changed. Claim 2 previously recited elements related to changing focus.

In rejecting now-cancelled claim 2, Examiner acknowledged that Schumacher and Weber do not teach "analyzing a plurality of associated actions that occurred after a change in focus from another application to the application to determine whether a complete event occurred." Similarly, these references also do not teach the amended features of claim 1 relating to changes in focus, namely "determining, with a capture processor, that focus has changed from a prior application being monitored by the capture processor to a new application being monitored by the capture processor" and "resetting, with a capture processor, the keystrokes captured from the prior application by clearing the captured keystrokes responsive to determining that focus has changed."

At the least, Gray also does not disclose "resetting" in the manner claimed. Gray discloses a method for capturing user events that are associated with screen objects on a computer display so that the events may later be reproduced. An event engine captures user events, such as keystrokes and mouse clicks, through application programming interfaces (APIs) that are supported by the applications being monitored. The event engine itself is controlled by a user interface. Different commands may be entered through the user interface to control the event engine, including commands to record, store, retrieve, and reproduce the user events. [*See* Gray, ¶¶ 6-8, Abstract]

In Gray, the event engine (i.e. capture processor) receives user events through Windows APIs and stores the events in a file. [*See* Gray, ¶ 38]. The event engine does interact with one or more APIs that are associated with the applications being monitored. [*See* Gray, ¶ 8]. However, the event engine does not reset any of the data received from the APIs when the user changes from one application to the next. Gray does not highlight any specific actions that are performed responsive to a focus change. Thus, Gray does not disclose "resetting, with a capture processor,

keystrokes captured from the prior application by clearing the captured keystrokes responsive to determining that focus has changed."

Examiner suggests that Gray discusses a change in focus at paragraph 42. Here, Gray describes the "open" command of the user interface that controls the event engine. When the user presses the "open" command, it prompts the user for the name of an existing event file and loads it. [S*ee* Gray, ¶ 42] Gray does not highlight any specific actions that are performed responsive to determining that the file is loaded. Instead, once the file is loaded, Gray simply waits for another user command to be entered. [See Gray, ¶ 48]. Thus, Gray does not disclose "resetting, with a capture processor, keystrokes captured from the prior application by clearing the captured keystrokes responsive to determining that focus has changed."

Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art considering the teachings of the cited references, either individually or in the combinations proposed by Examiner, would not have found claim 1 obvious. Independent claims 16, 38, and 41 have been amended to recite features similar in scope to those found in claim 1. The other independent and dependent claims are not obvious for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the § 103 rejection and recognize that the claims recite allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider and withdraw the pending rejections for the reasons provided above and allow the application. Applicant invites Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will advance prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 10, 2010

By: /Brian Hoffman/

Brian M. Hoffman, Reg. No. 39,713
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (415) 281-1350